arXiv:1604.07475v2 [math.MG] 6 Sep 2016

Generic Global and Universal Rigidity

Robert Connelly, Steven J. Gortler and Louis Theran

Abstract

We show that any graph that is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ has a realization in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that is both generic and universally rigid. It also must have a realization in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that is both infinitesimally rigid and universally rigid. Such a realization serves as a certificate of generic global rigidity. Previous certificates for generic global rigidity, even though they did involve calculations for particular configurations, did not necessarily guarantee that those configurations were globally rigid.

Our approach involves an algorithm by Lovász, Saks and Schrijver that, for a sufficiently connected graph, constructs a general position orthogonal representation of the vertices, and a result of Alfakih that shows how this representation leads to a stress matrix and a universally rigid framework of the graph.

Keywords: rigidity, global rigidity, universal rigidity

1 Introduction

In this paper we clarify one central aspect in the relationship between global and universal rigidity of frameworks of a graph.

Given a graph G (with n vertices and m edges) and a configuration $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{p_n})$ of its vertices in $\mathbb{R}^d$, we refer to the pair $(G, \mathbf{p})$ as a framework, and measure the Euclidean lengths along the edges of G between pairs of vertices in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We say that $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is *globally rigid* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if every framework, $(G, \mathbf{q})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, with the same edge lengths as $(G, \mathbf{p})$, is related to $(G, \mathbf{p})$ by a Euclidean transform.

We say that $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is is *universally rigid* if every framework, $(G, \mathbf{q})$ with the same edge lengths as $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in *any* dimension $\mathbb{R}^D$ is related to $(G, \mathbf{p})$ by a Euclidean transform.

We say that a graph G is *generically globally rigid* (GGR) in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if every "generic framework" of G in $\mathbb{R}^d$ (you can think of this as "almost every" framework in $\mathbb{R}^d$) is globally rigid. It turns out that if a graph is not generically globally rigid, then every "generic framework" of G in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is not globally rigid [15].

The universal rigidity of frameworks in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of G does not have such a simple behavior. There are graphs with open sets of frameworks that are universally rigid, and other open sets of frameworks that are not universally rigid [16]. For example, for the line $\mathbb{R}^1$, and when the graph G is a cycle, the only universally configurations are when one edge length is the sum of the others, although all the generic configurations are globally rigid in the line.

If one framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is universally rigid, then clearly this framework is globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, but this does not imply that the graph G itself, is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Indeed $\mathbf{p}$ might be somehow exceptional, and not representative of the generic behavior of frameworks of G in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Figure 1 shows two examples of frameworks that are universally rigid in the plane because the vertices form a regular hexagon. Generically, the underlying graph, $K_{3,3}$, is minimally rigid, and thus not globally rigid [18].



Figure 1: Universally rigid frameworks of a graph that is not generically globally rigid.

On the other hand, if we can find a (Euclidean) open set of configurations of G in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that are universally rigid (and thus globally rigid), then this in fact implies that G is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ [15]. (We may replace "open set of configurations" by either "a single generic framework" or "a single infinitesimally rigid framework" without changing the conclusion.)

In this paper we show the converse. Namely, if a G is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then it has a Euclidean open set of frameworks in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that are universally rigid. This answers a question posed by Gortler and Thurston [16] for $d \geq 3$. Our method applies for $d \geq 1$, but the cases $d = 1$ and $d = 2$ have already been settled [23, 21]. Both [23] and [21] rely, in a fundamental way, on the classification of GGR graphs for $d = 2$ [5, 20]. Since even the generically locally rigid graphs are not classified in $d \geq 3$, we need a different technique.

Our approach is to analyze a construction due to Alfakih [2], which builds on work of Lovász, Saks and Schriver [24]. The main result of [24] is that any $(d+1)$-connected graph admits an $n-d-1$-dimensional "orthogonal representation" in general position. Alfakih [2] showed how to convert these representations into positive semidefinite (PSD) stress matrices of rank $n-d-1$, which then yield universally rigid frameworks $(G, \mathbf{p})$.

Since $(d+1)$-connectivity is strictly weaker than generic global rigidity [18], there are graphs G for which *all* the universally rigid frameworks $(G, \mathbf{p})$ constructed by Alfakih's method are infinitesimally flexible and thus lie in a proper algebraic subset of configurations. Our main result says that this does not happen when G is GGR.

Alfakih's construction is an example of "form finding" as used in the engineering literature, for example in [12] and [10]. This is particularly similar to [10] since it creates an appropriate equilibrium stress first and then uses that to find the configuration.

Note that since all the configuration produced by Alfakih's construction are in general affine position, and G is required to to be $(d+1)$-connected, there are many frameworks (for example, those of Figure 2) with maximal rank PSD equilibrium stress matrix that cannot be constructed this way.

Our results have an algorithmic interpretation as well. The *graph realization* or *distance geometry problem* is, to find an unknown d-dimensional framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ from the data (G, ℓ), where ℓ are the edge lengths of $(G, \mathbf{p})$. This is clearly impossible when $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is not globally rigid.

Graph realization is an NP-hard problem [25], for which there is a well-known SDP (convex) relaxation (see, e.g., [22]). So and Ye [26] showed that if ℓ comes from measuring the edge lengths of a d-dimensional framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ that is universally rigid, then the SDP relaxation will correctly reconstruct $(G, \mathbf{p})$ from (G, ℓ). Our present result tells us the GGR graphs are *precisely* those for which this SDP relaxation has a positive probability of success, taken over the choice of unknown d-dimensional configurations.



Figure 2: A framework with a maximal rank PSD equilibrium stress matrices that does not arise from Alfakih's construction.

2 Background

Let G be a graph with n vertices and m edges. Let d be a fixed dimension. Throughout, we will assume that $n \geq d+2$.

A (bar and joint) framework in $\mathbb{R}^d$, denoted as $(G, \mathbf{p})$, is a graph G together with a configuration $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{p}_n)$ of points in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

2.1 Rigidity of Frameworks

We say that the framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is *locally rigid* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if, except for congruences, there are no continuous motions in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of the configuration $\mathbf{p}(t)$, for $t \geq 0$, that preserve the distance constraints:

$$|\mathbf{p}_i(t) - \mathbf{p}_j(t)| = |\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j| \tag{1}$$

for all edges, $\{i, j\}$, of G, where $\mathbf{p}(0) = \mathbf{p}$. By a congruence, we mean that $\mathbf{p}(t)$ is simply the restriction of an isometry of $\mathbb{R}^d$ to the vertices. If a framework is not locally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, it is called *locally flexible* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ or equivalently just *flexible* or a *finite mechanism*.

The simplest way to confirm that a framework is locally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is look at the linearization of the problem.

A *first-order flex* or *infinitesimal flex* of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is a corresponding assignment of vectors $\mathbf{p}' = (\mathbf{p}'_1, \ldots, \mathbf{p}'_n)$, $\mathbf{p}'_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for each $\{i, j\}$, an edge of G, the following holds:

$$(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j) \cdot (\mathbf{p}'_i - \mathbf{p}'_j) \quad = \quad 0 \tag{2}$$

A first-order flex in $\mathbb{R}^d$ $\mathbf{p}'$ is *trivial* if it is the restriction to the vertices, of the time-zero derivative of a smooth motion of isometries of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Note that the property of being trivial is independent of the graph G.

The *rigidity matrix* $R(\mathbf{p})$ is the nd-by-m matrix, where

$$R(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{p}' = (\ldots, (\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j) \cdot (\mathbf{p}'_i - \mathbf{p}'_j), \ldots)^T,$$

for $\mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$,

A framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is called *infinitesimally rigid* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if it has no infinitesimal flexes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ except for trivial ones. When $n \geq d$ this is the same as saying that the rank of $R(\mathbf{p})$ is $nd - \binom{d+1}{2}$. If a framework is not infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, it is called *infinitesimally flexible* in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

A classical theorem states:

Theorem 1. *If a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then it is locally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

The converse is not true (but see Theorem 4 below).

A framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is called *globally rigid in* $\mathbb{R}^d$ if, there are no other other (even distant) frameworks $(G, \mathbf{q})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ having the same edge lengths as $(G, \mathbf{p})$, other than congruent frameworks. Congruence means that there is an isometry of all of $\mathbb{R}^d$ that takes $\mathbf{q}$ to $\mathbf{p}$. If a framework is not globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, it is called *globally flexible* in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

A framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is called *universally rigid* if, there are no other other (even distant) frameworks $(G, \mathbf{q})$ in $\mathbb{R}^D$, for any D, having the same edge lengths as $(G, \mathbf{p})$, other than congruent frameworks in $\mathbb{R}^D$. If a framework is not universally rigid, it is called *universally flexible*.

Clearly universal rigidity implies global rigidity (in any dimension) which implies local rigidity (in any dimension).

Given a graph G, a *stress vector* $\omega = (\dots, \omega_{ij}, \dots)$, is an assignment of a real scalar $\omega_{ij} = \omega_{ji}$ to each edge, $\{i, j\}$ in G. (We have $\omega_{ij} = 0$, when $\{i, j\}$ is not an edge of G.)

We say that ω is an *equilibrium stress vector* for $(G, \mathbf{p})$ if the vector equation

$$\sum_j \omega_{ij}(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j) = 0 \tag{3}$$

holds for all vertices i of G. The equilibrium stress vectors of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ form the co-kernel of its rigidity matrix $R(\mathbf{p})$.

We associate an n-by-n *stress matrix* Ω to a stress vector ω, by saying that i, j entry of Ω is $-\omega_{ij}$, for $i \neq j$, and the diagonal entries of Ω are such that the row and column sums of Ω are zero. The stress matrices of G are simply the symmetric matrices with zeros associated to non-edge pairs, and such that the vector of all-ones is in its kernel.

If ω is an equilibrium stress vector for $(G, \mathbf{p})$ then we say that the associated Ω is an *equilibrium stress matrix* for $(G, \mathbf{p})$. For each of the d spacial dimensions, if we define a vector $\mathbf{v}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by collecting the the associated coordinate over all of the points in $\mathbf{p}$, we have $\Omega\mathbf{v} = 0$. Thus if the dimension of the affine span of the vertices $\mathbf{p}$ is d, then the rank of Ω is at most $n - d - 1$, but it could be less.

Let $(G, \mathbf{p})$ be a framework (in any dimension) with a d-dimensional affine span, $\langle \mathbf{p} \rangle$. Fixing an affine frame for $\langle \mathbf{p} \rangle$, we can represent $\mathbf{p}$ using coordinates in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We say that the edges directions of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ lie on a conic at infinity of $\langle \mathbf{p} \rangle$ if there exists a non-zero symmetric d-by-d matrix Q such that for all of the edges, $\{ij\}$ in G, we have $(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j)^t Q (\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j) = 0$.

Following [7] we say a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ (in any dimension) with a d-dimensional affine span is *super stable* if there is an equilibrium stress ω for $(G, \mathbf{p})$ such that its associated stress matrix Ω is PSD, the rank of Ω is $n - d - 1$, and the edge directions do not lie on a conic at infinity of $\langle \mathbf{p} \rangle$.

The following is a classic theorem by Connelly [7]

Theorem 2. *Let $(G, \mathbf{p})$ be a framework (in any dimension). If $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is super stable then $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is universally rigid.*

Alfakih et al [1], showed that one can easily avoid the explicit assumption about conics at infinity in the case of general position.

Theorem 3. *Let $(G, \mathbf{p})$ be a framework with a d-dimensional affine span. If $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is in general affine position within $\langle \mathbf{p} \rangle$ and has an (even indefinite) equilibrium stress matrix of rank $n - d - 1$, then the edge directions of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ do not lie on a conic at infinity of $\langle \mathbf{p} \rangle$.*

Thus if $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is a framework with a d-dimensional affine span and in general affine position within $\langle \mathbf{p} \rangle$ and it has a PSD equilibrium stress matrix of rank $n - d - 1$, then it is super stable and thus universally rigid.

2.2 Rigidity of Graphs

We say that a configuration $\mathbf{p}$, or a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$, in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is *generic*, if there is no non-zero polynomial relation, with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}$, among the coordinates of $\mathbf{p}$.

We say that a graph G is *generically locally rigid (resp. flexible)* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if every generic framework of G in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is locally rigid (resp. flexible) in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

We say that a graph G is *generically infinitesimally rigid (resp. flexible)* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if every generic framework of G in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is infinitesimally rigid (resp. flexible) in $\mathbb{R}^d$. .

As described in [3, 4], generic local rigidity is determined by generic infinitesimal rigidity

Theorem 4. *If some framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then the graph G is generically infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and thus generically locally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

If a graph, G, is not generically infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ then it is generically locally flexible in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Thus, if G is not generically locally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ then it is generically locally flexible in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

We say that a graph G is *generically globally rigid (resp. flexible)* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if every generic framework of G in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is globally rigid (resp. flexible) in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

The following is the easy half of a theorem by Hendrickson [17], which we will need below.

Theorem 5. *If G is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then it must be $d+1$ connected.*

Connelly [9] proved the following sufficient condition for global rigidity.

Theorem 6. *If some generic framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ has an (even indefinite) equilibrium stress matrix of rank $n-d-1$, then the graph G is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

This was refined slightly in [15, 11] giving the following sufficient certificate for generic global rigidity

Theorem 7. *If some framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $(G, \mathbf{p})$ has an (even indefinite) equilibrium stress matrix Ω of rank $n-d-1$, then the graph G is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Thus, the pair Ω and $(G, \mathbf{p})$ serve as a certificate for the generic global rigidity of G in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Note that this does not imply that the specific framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in the above certificate is globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ [11].

Gortler Healy and Thurston [15] proved the strong converse to Theorem 6.

Theorem 8. *If some generic framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ does not have equilibrium stress matrix of rank $n-d-1$, then the graph G is not generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$. It is, in fact, generically globally flexible in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Thus, if a graph G is not generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ then it is generically globally flexible in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Remark 1. *The above theorems tell us that that a graph G is either generically (locally / infinitesimally / globally) rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, or it is generically (locally/infinitesimally/globally) flexible in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Due to the semi-algebraic nature of rigidity, if G is generically (locally / infinitesimally / globally) rigid (resp. flexible) in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then the only exceptional frameworks must be contained in an algebraic strict subvariety (defined over $\mathbb{Q}$) of configuration space.

Universal rigidity does not behave so simply. In particular, there are graphs with Euclidean open sets of frameworks in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that are universally rigid, and other open sets of frameworks in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that are not universally rigid [16].

Clearly a graph can be generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, while having some generic frameworks in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that are not universally rigid. One open question that has been open in the rigidity community since 2010 (see [16]) asks: If G is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, must it have *some* generic frameworks in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that are universally rigid?

The main result of this paper answers this question in the affirmative:

Theorem 9. *If G is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then there exists a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that is infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and super stable. Moreover, every framework in a small enough neighborhood of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ will be infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and super stable, and thus must include some generic framework.*

The first part of this theorem tells us that if G is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then it must have a certificate, Ω and $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in the sense of Theorem 7, where $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is itself certifiably super stable and thus globally rigid.

Remark 2. *Interestingly, this gives a new proof for a weak converse to Connelly's Theorem 6. Namely, If some generic framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ does not have equilibrium stress matrix of rank $n - d - 1$, then the graph G is not generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$. But this does not, alone, prove that G is, in fact, generically globally flexible in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

This paper will also use some basic facts from algebraic geometry, which are summarized in the appendix.

3 Stresses from GORs

In [24], Lovász Saks and Schriver define a concept called a (GOR) general position orthogonal representation of a graph G in $\mathbb{R}^{n-d-1}$. Alfakih [2] has shown how these relate to a certain class of equilibrium stresses for d-dimensional frameworks of G.

Definition 1. *Let G be a graph and let d be a fixed dimension. A (GOR) general position orthogonal representation of G is a vector configuration $\mathbf{v}$ indexed by the vertices of G in $\mathbb{R}^{n-d-1}$ with the following two added properties: $\mathbf{v}_i$ is orthogonal to the vectors associated with each non-neighbor of vertex i. The $\mathbf{v}_i$ are in general linear position.*

The relevant result from [24] is the following:

Theorem 10. *Assume that G is $d+1$ connected. Then the set of GORs is an irreducible semi-algebraic set of dimension $D_G := n(n-d) - \binom{n+1}{2} + m$.*

Proof. This follows from Theorems 1.1 and 2.1 in [24], (though our notation is different). Since they do not write down the dimension, we elaborate on that issue here.

Consider the following construction of frameworks by Lovász et al. Fix any ordering of the vertices. Now place the vertices into $\mathbb{R}^{n-d-1}$ in order.

At stage i assume we have a GOR on the subgraph of G induced by the vertices $j < i$. At stage i, look at all of vertex i's non-neighbors j with $j < i$. Let $\bar{e}_i$ denote the number of such non-neighbors. Place v_i anywhere in the subspace that is orthogonal to these v_j. This subspace is of dimension $(n-d-1) - \bar{e}_i = (n-d-1) - (i-1-e_i) = n-d-i+e_i$, where e_i is the number of edges from i to any previous vertex. If the resulting framework is not in general linear position, then exit. (Note that for some constructed GORs on the previous $i-1$ vertices, there may be no way to place vertex i so that the result is in general linear position). Otherwise we have successfully

constructed a GOR on a bigger subgraph and so we continue. After n successful steps, we will have produced a GOR on G. Clearly, the image of this process is all of the GORs.

Lovász et al. prove that, assuming that G is $d+1$ connected, (Theorem 1.1 [24]) that this process will succeed (not exit early in our description) with probability 1, and (Theorem 2.1 [24]) after each stage, GOR_i, the GORs on the subgraph, form a irreducible semi-algebraic set of some dimension in the configuration space, $\mathbb{R}^{i(n-d-1)}$.

Now let us calculate its dimension. Let π be the projection of GOR_i on to the subspace $\mathbb{R}^{(i-1)(n-d-1)}$ corresponding to the first $i-1$ vertices. From Theorem 1.1 of [24], (namely the probability 1 success of the construction) we have $\dim(\pi(\mathrm{GOR}_i)) = \dim(\mathrm{GOR}_{i-1})$.

As an irreducible semi-algebraic set, we have from Theorem 12 in the Appendix that $\dim(\mathrm{GOR}_i) = \dim(\pi(\mathrm{GOR}_i)) + \dim(\pi^{-1}(\pi(x)) \cap N(x))$ where x is generic in GOR_i and $N(x)$ is a neighborhood around x.

Meanwhile, from the construction above, it is clear that any fiber, $\pi^{-1}(\pi(x))$, is a Zariski open subset of a linear space of dimension $n-d-i+e_i$. Thus the dimension of GOR_i is $n-d-i+e_i$ more than the dimension of GOR_{i-1}.

Summing over all n stages, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} n-d-i+e_i$, we obtain the result. □

Alfakih [2] proves that each GOR can be turned into a stress matrix Ω with a super stable framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ "in its kernel" (each of the d coordinates of $\mathbf{p}$ lie in the kernel of Ω).

Theorem 11. *Any GOR can be mapped to to a PSD stress matrix Ω of rank $n-d-1$. Moreover, any full dimensional $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in the kernel of such an Ω must be in general affine position and thus be super stable.*

Definition 2. *Let the* Lovász, Saks and Schriver stresses*,* LSS*, be the semi-algebraic set of stresses obtained from the above theorem, and D_L the dimension of this set.*

Corollary 1. *Assume that G is $d+1$ connected. Then $D_L = m - \binom{d+1}{2}$*

Proof. Alfakih's mapping takes a GOR, represented as an n-by-$(n-d-1)$ matrix X, and then computes its Gram matrix XX^t. This process removes $\binom{n-d-1}{2}$ degrees of freedom representing orthonormal transforms in $\mathbb{R}^{n-d-1}$. Due to the orthogonality of a GOR, these matrices have zeros in entries corresponding to non-edges. These matrices are PSD and of rank $n-d-1$. They are not yet stress matrices, as the all-ones vector need not be in its kernel.

Alfakih then finds a set of full rank diagonal matrices D, such that $\Omega := DXX^tD$ has the all-ones vector in its kernel, making it a stress matrix. To count the impact of this step on the dimensions, first remove n degrees of freedom, by normalizing each of the vectors in X, so that XX^t has all-ones on its diagonal. Then we note that Alfakih's construction finds a $d+1$-dimensional set of appropriate D. All of these Ω are now PSD stress matrices of rank $n-d-1$.

Then starting with Theorem 10, we calculate $D_L = D_G - \binom{n-d-1}{2} - n + (d+1) = m - \binom{d+1}{2}$. □

Remark 3. *In Alfakih's construction, if one starts with a fixed GOR, and one varies the admissible D matrices, the resulting Ω matrices will differ only through scaling. Thus all of the d-dimensional frameworks in the kernels of these Ω must only differ through d-dimensional projective transforms [11].*

Remark 4. *Alfakih's theorem is tight in the following sense. Suppose one starts with an orthogonal representation with a linear span of dimension $n-d-1$, but* not *in general linear position, and then applies Alfakih's construction. Suppose one is successful in obtaining a PSD stress matrix Ω with rank $n-d-1$. Then any framework in its kernel will* not *be in general affine position in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

(Note: when the orthogonal representation is not in general linear position, it is possible that there is no appropriate full rank D matrix to complete the stress construction.)

Proof: *In such an Ω, there will be a linearly dependent set of $n-d-1$ columns, corresponding to some $n-d-1$ vertices of the graph. Thus Ω must have a kernel vector with at least $d+1$ zero entries (in the complement set of vertices). Meanwhile any kernel vector of a rank $n-d-1$ stress matrix must arise as some one dimensional affine projection of any d-dimensional framework, $(G, \mathbf{p})$, in its kernel. The $d+1$ zero entries in this projection mean that $(G, \mathbf{p})$ cannot be in general affine position.*

4 Example: $K_{2,2}$ in $\mathbb{R}^1$

As a concrete example of Alfakih's construction, we consider the case of $K_{2,2}$ in $\mathbb{R}^1$. For convenience label the vertices u_1, u_2, v_3, v_4, so that the edges are $\{u_i, v_j\}$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. The universally rigid configurations are those with one "long edge" and three "short" ones [23, 21]. We can explore these from the perspective of GORs for $K_{2,2}$ in dimension $\mathbb{R}^2$ (since $n = 4$ and $d = 1$). For convenience denote a GOR of $K_{2,2}$ by $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$.

The space of GORs is easy to describe: we have $\mathbf{u}_1 \perp \mathbf{u}_2$, $\mathbf{v}_1 \perp \mathbf{v}_2$, and the angle, θ, between $\mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{v}_1$ is not a multiple of $\pi/2$. This is clearly a 6-dimensional set, in accordance with Theorem 10.

To explore the example more directly, we define a curve of reference GORs parameterized by the angle θ.

$$\mathbf{u}_1^\theta := \mathbf{i}e^{-\mathbf{i}\theta/2} \quad \mathbf{u}_2^\theta := e^{-\mathbf{i}\theta/2} \quad \mathbf{v}_1^\theta := \mathbf{i}e^{\mathbf{i}\theta/2} \quad \mathbf{v}_2^\theta := -e^{\mathbf{i}\theta/2}$$

where we have identified $\mathbb{R}^2$ with $\mathbb{C}$ to keep the formulas compact, and $\mathbf{i}$ is the imaginary unit.

Given a GOR, Alfakih's construction will scale the vectors so that their sum is the origin; call such a "centered" GOR a GORC. The space of GORCs, in general, has dimension $D_L + \binom{n-d-1}{2} = D_G - n + d + 1$, since the Gram matrix of each $O(n-d-1)$-orbit of GORCs gives a stress in LSS and the centering condition imposes a linear constraint on each coordinate. In this example, the GORCs are a 4-dimensional set. Thus, $K_{2,2}$ has a 3-dimensional space for LSS, as expected from Corollary 1.

Using our reference curve, and noting the reflection symmetry of this parameterization, we see that, for $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$

$$|\mathbf{u}_2^\theta + \mathbf{v}_2^\theta| \, (\mathbf{u}_1^\theta + \mathbf{v}_1^\theta) + |\mathbf{u}_1^\theta + \mathbf{v}_1^\theta| \, (\mathbf{u}_2^\theta + \mathbf{v}_2^\theta) \;\; = \;\; 0 \tag{4}$$

and

$$|\mathbf{u}_2^\theta + \mathbf{v}_1^\theta| \, (\mathbf{v}_2^\theta - \mathbf{u}_1^\theta) + |\mathbf{v}_2^\theta - \mathbf{u}_1^\theta| \, (\mathbf{u}_2^\theta + \mathbf{v}_1^\theta) \;\; = \;\; 0 \tag{5}$$

This gives us basis for scalings of a reference GOR to a GORC. These two scalings, along with θ, parameterize LSS for this interval, since there are three independent parameters.

For a fixed θ, applying a different scaling leads to a different GORC. The effect on the kernel framework, by Remark 3, is to apply a projective transformation. This is illustrated in Figure 3, where the left column uses the scaling (4) and the right column uses (5). The color coding is: u_1 in dark red; u_2 in bright red; v_1 in dark blue; v_2 in bright blue. The top row shows two GORCs at $\theta = \pi/6$ and the bottom row the associated kernel frameworks. As is expected, in each case there is one red-blue vector pair with positive dot product, corresponding to a negative ω value on the long edge of that framework (represented with a thick line). Edges with positive ω are shown with a dotted line and edges with zero ω are shown in thin green.



Figure 3: Two GORCs with $\theta = \pi/6$. Their kernel frameworks are related by a projective transformation.



Figure 4: Universally rigid configurations of $K_{2,2}$ in $\mathbb{R}^1$.

Figure 4 illustrates the sequence of kernel frameworks associated with the scaling (4), which holds on $[0, \pi]$, as θ increases from 0 to π, using a consistent affine normalization. At the endpoints of the interval, the "GOR" is no longer in general position. Moreover, the "GORC" generated by this scaling degenerates, yielding a rank 1 stress matrix; in the figure, we show the kernel framework that is the limit as $\theta \to 0$ in part (a). The limit stress at $\theta = 0$ has $\omega = 1$ for the edge between bright red and bright blue and $\omega = 0$ for the other edges. In part (k), where $\theta = \pi/2$, the "GOR" is also no longer in general position, but under the scaling, we still obtain a stress matrix of rank 2, as in Remark 4. This stress has $\omega = 1$ for the edges between dark blue and bright red, and between bright blue and dark red, and $\omega = 0$ for the other edges.

5 Stratification of Stresses

We want to look at all equilibrium stresses for all d-dimensional frameworks of G, and see which ones correspond to those constructed above in LSS. We will do this by slicing the configuration space into subsets that are easy to analyze on their own. We will find that, when G is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, the equilibrium stresses arising from infinitesimally flexible frameworks can

account for only a low dimensional subset of the equilibrium stresses of LSS. This will then lead immediately to a proof of our Theorem 9.

5.1 The Subsets

We now chop up the configuration space, $\mathbb{R}^{nd}$ into nicely behaved subsets. It will be helpful for each of these subsets, S, to be invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms. That means that if $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2.., \mathbf{p}_n) \in S$ and A is an invertible affine transform, then $A(\mathbf{p}) := (A(\mathbf{p}_1), A(\mathbf{p}_2).., A(\mathbf{p}_n)) \in S$.

Lemma 1. *Let S be a (reducible) semi-algebraic set of configurations that is invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms. Let r be the maximal rank of the rigidity matrices over all $\mathbf{p} \in S$. Let S' be the semi-algebraic subset of S, where the rigidity matrix has rank less than r. Then S' is invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms.*

Proof. The rank of the rigidity matrix of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms acting on $\mathbf{p}$. □

Lemma 2. *Let S be a (reducible) semi-algebraic set of configurations that is invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms. Then its singular (non-smooth) set is invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms.*

Proof. Each such affine transform gives us an algebraic automorphism of S. An automorphism induces an isomorphism on the Zariski tangent spaces and thus must map singular points to singular points. □

We thank Dylan P. Thurston for the proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *Let S be a reducible semi-algebraic set of configurations that is invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms. Then each irreducible component S_i of S is invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the set of invertible affine transforms; this is an irreducible semi-algebraic set. Let g_i be the map $S_i \times \mathcal{A} \to S$, which sends $(\mathbf{p}; A) := (\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2.., \mathbf{p}_n; A)$ to $A(\mathbf{p}) := (A(\mathbf{p}_1), A(\mathbf{p}_2).., A(\mathbf{p}_n))$. Since its domain is irreducible, the image of the polynomial map, g_i, must be irreducible. Moreover, since the identity map is in $\mathcal{A}$, the image of g_i must contain S_i. But since a component, by definition, must be maximal, S_i cannot be a strict subset of this irreducible image. Thus it agrees with it. Thus S_i is invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms. □

Now we describe how we slice up configuration space.

Definition 3. *Let G be a graph. We will consider a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ as a single point in the configuration space, $\mathbb{R}^{nd}$. Let* IR *be the set of infinitesimally rigid frameworks of G in $\mathbb{R}^d$. If G is generically infinitesimal rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then* IR *is a Zariski open subset of configuration space. Otherwise it is empty. Thus IR is a smooth irreducible semi-algebraic set, invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms.*

Let IF *be the infinitesimally flexible frameworks, with a full d-dimensional affine span. We repeatedly break up* IF *into a finite number of semi-algebraic sets* IF_i *until we achieve the following properties. Each* IF_i *has rigidity matrices of a constant rank, is smooth, and is irreducible. From Lemmas 1, 2 and 3, each* IF_i *is invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms.*

Let C_i be the codimension of IF_i *within the nd-dimensional set of configurations.*

Let F_i' be the dimension, for each framework in IF_i*, of its space of infinitesimal flexes. Let $F_i := F_i' - \binom{d+1}{2}$, which discounts the dimension of the trivial infinitesimal flexes.*

Definition 4. *Let* Str(IR) *and* Str(IF_i) *be the union of the equilibrium stress matrices over its framework set. These are semi-algebraic sets as well.*

Remark 5. *In the above decomposition, the property of constant rank rigidity matrices will be used throughout our reasoning.*

The invariance to invertible affine transforms will be needed in Lemmas 4 and 5, where we need to carefully count the dimension of Str(IR) *and the* Str(IF_i).

The irreducibility of each IF_i *will be important in Section 5.3, where we want there to be a well defined notion of a generic point, and thus a well defined generic dimension of tangential flexes.*

The smoothness of each IF_i *will be convenient throughout, but will be especially needed in Lemma 8, where we will want the generic frameworks of* IF_i *to be dense in* IF_i. *(A non smooth real variety, such as the Whitney umbrella can have a locus of singular points, such as the handle of the umbrella, that have no nearby smooth points.)*

The following Lemma is not needed for the proof of our theorem, but is useful in setting up the proof of Lemma 5 below.

Lemma 4. *Let* G *be generically globally rigid in* $\mathbb{R}^d$. *Then* $\dim(\text{Str}(\text{IR})) = m - \binom{d+1}{2} = D_L$.

Proof. We want to count the total dimension of equilibrium stresses over all frameworks in IR, but we need to be careful not to double count.

From Theorem 4 the dimension of IR is nd.

The rank of the rigidity matrix of any framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in IR is $nd - \binom{d+1}{2}$, and so the dimension of equilibrium stresses for this single framework is $m - nd + \binom{d+1}{2}$.

Let the equilibrium stress bundle of IR, a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{nd} \times \mathbb{R}^m$, consist of pairs $(\mathbf{p}, \omega)$ where $(G, \mathbf{p}) \in$ IR and ω is an equilibrium stress of $(G, \mathbf{p})$. This is a vector bundle over IR. The projection, π_2, of this bundle onto its second factor, gives us Str(IR).

From Lemma 11 the bundle, is irreducible and has dimension $nd + [m - nd + \binom{d+1}{2}] = m + \binom{d+1}{2}$.

Let us now look at one $(\mathbf{p}, \Omega)$, some generic point of the bundle. From Lemma 10, the configuration $\mathbf{p}$ must be a generic configuration. Since G is generically globally rigid, then from Theorem 8, the generic framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ must have an equilibrium stress matrix of rank $n - d - 1$. Thus, from genericity, Ω must achieve this rank.

Now we look at π_2, in the neighborhood around $(\mathbf{p}, \Omega)$. Since Ω has rank $n - d - 1$, the fiber of π_2 consists of affine transforms of a $\mathbf{p}$ and must have dimension $d(d+1)$. So from Theorem 12, the dimension of the image must be $m + \binom{d+1}{2} - d(d+1) = m - \binom{d+1}{2}$.

From Theorem 5, G must be $d+1$ connected and so from Corollary 1 this dimension agrees with D_L. □

Remark 6. *When* G *is not generically globally rigid in* $\mathbb{R}^d$, *then all of the stresses in* Str(IR) *must be of rank less than* $n-d-1$, *and thus the fibers under* π_2 *are larger and thus* $\dim(\text{Str}(\text{IR})) < m - \binom{d+1}{2}$.

5.2 The IF_i with few infinitesimal flexes can only account for low dimensional subsets of LSS

Lemma 5. *Let* G *be any graph. Then for any* i *such that* $C_i > F_i$, *we have* $\dim(\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)) < m - \binom{d+1}{2}$. *Thus, when* G *is* $d+1$ *connected, then* $\dim(\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)) < D_L$.

Proof. We proceed exactly as in the proof of Lemma 4.

By assumption the dimension of IF_i is $nd - C_i$ and the dimension of equilibrium stresses for any single framework in IF_i is $m - nd + \binom{d+1}{2} + F_i$.

Let the equilibrium stress bundle of IF_i, a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{nd} \times \mathbb{R}^m$, consist of pairs $(\mathbf{p}, \omega)$ where $(G, \mathbf{p}) \in \text{IF}_i$ and ω is an equilibrium stress of $(G, \mathbf{p})$. The projection, π_2, of this bundle onto its second factor, gives us $\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)$.

From Lemma 12, this bundle is irreducible and has dimension $[nd - C_i] + [m - nd + \binom{d+1}{2} + F_i]$ which by assumption is strictly less than $m + \binom{d+1}{2}$.

The fiber of π_2 around some generic $(\mathbf{p}, \Omega)$ includes at least the invertible affine images of $\mathbf{p}$, and so is of dimension at least $d(d+1)$. Thus the dimension of the image of π_2 is strictly less than $m - \binom{d+1}{2}$.

From Corollary 1, when G is $d+1$ connected, $D_L = m - \binom{d+1}{2}$. □

5.3 Any IF_i with many tangential infinitesimal flexes cannot account for any stresses in LSS

Definition 5. *Let T_i' be the dimension, at any generic point $\mathbf{p}$ in IF_i, of the space of infinitesimal flexes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ (each thought of a single vector in $\mathbb{R}^{nd}$) that are tangential to the manifold IF_i at $\mathbf{p}$. Define $T_i := T_i' - \binom{d+1}{2}$, to discount the infinitesimal flexes arising from the group $SE(d)$ (these must all be tangential, since IF_i is invariant with respect to invertible affine transforms). Non-generically within IF_i, the dimension of tangential infinitesimal flexes can rise.*

Let $X_i := F_i - T_i$. This quantity represents the dimension, at any generic point $\mathbf{p}$ in IF_i, of a linear space of (necessarily non-trivial) infinitesimal flexes that is linearly independent from the tangent space of IF_i at $\mathbf{p}$.

Remark 7. *Non-generically within IF_i, the dimension of tangential infinitesimal flexes can rise. One might be tempted to simply refine our stratification based on this property, cutting out such loci into their own IF_i. The problem with this approach, is that it is no longer clear that the resulting subdivided IF_i will be invariant to invertible affine transformations.*

In particular suppose $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ in some (unsubdivided) IF_i are related by a d-dimensional invertible affine transform with $\mathbf{M}$ as its linear factor. Then the tangent of IF_i at $\mathbf{p}$ will map under $\mathbf{M}$ to the tangent of IF_i at $\mathbf{q}$. On the other hand, some flex $\mathbf{p}'$ of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ will map to a flex of $(G, \mathbf{q})$ through the dual map $\mathbf{M}^{-t}$.

Lemma 6. *Let G be any graph. For any IF_i such that $T_i \geq 1$, every generic framework $(G, \mathbf{q})$ in IF_i must be locally flexible in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Proof. Consider the smooth map from IF_i to $\mathbb{R}^m$ that measures squared edge lengths. The kernel of the linearization of the map at any configuration $\mathbf{p} \in \text{IF}_i$ consists of the infinitesimal flexes for $(G, \mathbf{p})$ that are tangential to IF_i. A regular point of this map is a configuration where the dimension of the kernel of the linearization of the map is at its minimum (and generic) value, $T_i + \binom{d+1}{2}$. Every generic point in IF_i is a regular point of this map.

At a regular point, $\mathbf{q}$, using the constant rank theorem, we see that locally, there is a $T_i + \binom{d+1}{2}$-dimensional submanifold of IF_i that maintains the edge lengths of $\mathbf{q}$. This fiber gives us our desired non-trivial, finite flex. □

Lemma 7. *If $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is a framework in IF_i (resp. IR) and is super stable, then so too is any other nearby-enough framework $(G, \mathbf{q})$ in IF_i (resp. IR).*

Proof. By assumption, $(G, \mathbf{p})$ has a PSD equilibrium stress matrix Ω of rank $n - d - 1$. From Lemma 13, any nearby $(G, \mathbf{q})$ in IF_i (resp. IR) must have some equilibrium stress matrix close to Ω. Since eigenvalues vary continuously with the matrix, this nearby equilibrium stress matrix must

retain its $n-d-1$ positive eigenvalues. As an equilibrium stress matrix, it cannot gain any more non-zero eigenvalues, and is thus PSD.

By assumption, $(G, \mathbf{p})$ does not have its edges on a conic at infinity. Clearly, any nearby framework in $\mathbb{R}^{nd}$ must not have its edges at a conic at infinity. □

Lemma 8. *Let G be any graph. For any* IF_i *such that $T_i \geq 1$, it must be that* $\mathrm{Str}(\mathrm{IF}_i)$) *is disjoint from* LSS*.*

Proof. If any framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in IF_i were super stable, then from Lemma 7, so too would be any nearby enough framework in IF_i. Since IF_i is smooth, the generic frameworks of IF_i are (Euclidean) dense in IF_i. Thus there would be a nearby $\mathbf{q}$ which is generic in IF_i and such that $(G, \mathbf{q})$ is super stable. But from Lemma 6, since $T_i \geq 1$, there can be no such $(G, \mathbf{q})$. So $(G, \mathbf{p})$ cannot be super stable.

On the other hand, from Theorem 11, all frameworks (with a d-dimensional affine span) arising as the kernels of the stresses from LSS, must be super stable. □

5.4 When G is generically globally rigid, there can be no IF_i with many transverse infinitesimal flexes

Lemma 9. *Let G be generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then for all i, we have $C_i > X_i$.*

Proof. Otherwise we could apply Connelly's global flexibility argument from [8] and obtain a contradiction with the assumed generic global rigidity. For completeness, we will spell out this argument in detail.

From Lemma 14, we can define a rational map (f stands for flex), $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}) : \mathrm{IF}_i \times \mathbb{R}^{F_i} \to \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ that (over its domain/where there is no division by zero) maps to a non-trivial infinitesimal flex $\mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ of $\mathbf{p}$, and for a fixed $\mathbf{p}$, the map is a linear injective map over $\mathbf{x}$. Let $\mathbf{p}^0$ denote some configuration that is generic in IF_i, around which f is well defined.

Given f, define the rational map (o stands for offset), $o(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{p} + f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x})$, that offsets $\mathbf{p}$ by an infinitesimal flex. Now we look at the image of the linearization, o^* at $(\mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{0})$. By varying just the $\mathbf{p}$-variables, we see that this image contains the tangent space of IF_i at $\mathbf{p}^0$ (of dimension $nd - C_i$). By varying just the $\mathbf{x}$-variables, we see that this image contains a space of non-trivial flexes of dimension F_i. Since $\mathbf{p}^0$ is generic in IF_i, this space contains a linear space of dimension X_i that is linearly independent from the tangent space of IF_i at $\mathbf{p}^0$. Thus the image of the linearization is of dimension at least $nd - C_i + X_i$ (and no greater than nd). When $C_i \leq X_i$, this rank is nd and so we have a local submersion. As a result, the image of o has dimension nd. Thus we have shown that a full dimensional subset of configurations can be reached by starting with an infinitesimally flexible framework in IF_i and adding to it some non-trivial infinitesimal flex.

By the de-averaging principle [8], when $\mathbf{p}$ has a full d-dimensional affine span (as all frameworks in IF do by assumption) and $\mathbf{p}'$ is a non-trivial infinitesimal flex, then $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}'$ must be globally flexible in $\mathbb{R}^d$. But our construction has found a full dimensional set of such configurations, which contradicts the assumed generic global rigidity. □

5.5 Putting these together

Putting these together, we arrive at our main proposition:

Proposition 1. *If G is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then a full dimensional subset of* LSS *is contained in* $\mathrm{Str}(\mathrm{IR})$*.*

Proof. The sets, IR and IF_i cover all configurations with a full affine span, and thus Str(IR) and ($\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)$) must contain all of equilibrium stresses of all configurations with full affine spans. Meanwhile, from Theorem 11, all of the stresses in LSS arise as equilibrium stress matrices of configurations in general affine position and thus with full affine spans. Thus LSS must be contained in the union Str(IR) and $\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)$.

First we show that LSS must be disjoint from the $\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)$ where $C_i \leq F_i = X_i + T_i$. When $C_i \leq F_i$ then either (a) $C_i \leq X_i$ or (b) $T_i \geq 1$. The case (a) cannot occur at all due to Lemma 9. In case (b), LSS must be disjoint from $\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)$ due to Lemma 8.

Next we look at the $\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)$ where $C_i > F_i$. From Theorem 5, G is $d+1$ connected. But then from Lemma 5, these $\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)$ are of lower dimension than LSS. Thus only a low dimensional subset of LSS can be contained in these $\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)$.

Thus a full dimensional subset of LSS must not be contained in the union of the $\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)$ and thus must be be contained in Str(IR). □

Remark 8. *When G is $d+1$ connected but not generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then from the above discussion we see that almost all of the stresses in* LSS *must come from* IF_i *where $C_i \leq X_i$.*

And now we can prove our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 9. From Proposition 1, there must be an Ω that is both in LSS and in Str(IR). Thus there must be a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ which is infinitesimally rigid and has Ω as one of its equilibrium stress matrix. From Theorem 11, Ω must be PSD of rank $n-d-1$, and so $(G, \mathbf{p})$ must be super stable.

For the second part, we use Lemma 7 to conclude that any nearby framework in IR must be super stable. As IR is full dimensional and open, any nearby framework in configuration space must be infinitesimally rigid and super stable. Such a neighborhood contains a generic configuration. □

6 The Stress Variety

The main theorem in this paper relates to a deeper question about the algebraic set of stress matrices. As above, let G be a graph with n vertices and m edges, and d a fixed dimension.

Definition 6. *Let* Str *be the real variety of n-by-n d-*dimensional stress matrices *for G. Specifically, this is the set of real symmetric matrices that have* 0 *entries corresponding to non-edges of G, with the all-ones vector in its kernel, and with rank $n-d-1$ or less. Note that the set* Str *is the union of* Str(IR) *and all of the* $\text{Str}(\text{IF}_i)$ *described above.*

Question 1. *Suppose that G is generically globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Is its associated d-dimensional stress variety,* Str*, irreducible?*

There are some results in the literature about the irreducibility of certain linear sections of determinantal varieties [14, 13], but these do not appear to be strong enough to answer the present question.

The irreducibility of Str would be useful, since any strict algebraic subset W of an irreducible (semi-)algebraic set must be of strictly lower dimension! In particular, an affirmative answer to this question would then lead to an alternative direct proof of Theorem 9, which we now sketch:

As described in Section B.3, we can select a rational map that maps from a matrix $\Omega \in \text{Str}$ to a framework in its kernel with a d-dimensional affine span. In the image of this map, $d+1$ chosen vertices will always lie in some pinned positions. The map will be undefined over some subvariety V of Str. (The subvariety V consists of all of the Ω of rank strictly less than $n-d-1$ and any

Ω of rank $n-d-1$ which is an equilibrium stress matrix of a d-dimensional framework where the chosen $d+1$ vertices lie in a single hyperplane.)

The preimage of the algebraic set, IF, must lie in some algebraic subset W of Str. By Theorem 8, this subset of Str is strict.

Suppose that there is an $\Omega \in \text{Str(IF)}$ that has rank $n-d-1$ and is the equilibrium stress of an infinitesimally flexible framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ with the chosen $d+1$ vertices in general affine position. Then our rational map must map Ω to a configuration $\mathbf{q}$ which is an affine transform of $\mathbf{p}$. The framework $(G, \mathbf{q})$ must be in IF, and thus $\Omega \in W$.

Thus Str(IF) must lie in the union of V and W. The rest of the matrices, $\text{Str} - (V \cup W)$, must be in Str(IR). When Str is irreducible, the subset $V \cup W$ must be of strictly lower dimension than Str itself.

Meanwhile, Lemma 4 tells us that the dimension of Str(IR) is $m - \binom{d+1}{2}$. Thus the dimension of Str(IF) is strictly less than $m - \binom{d+1}{2}$ and thus less than D_L. And we are done. □

Our question is also related to one posed by Lovász et al [24].

Definition 7. *An (OR) orthogonal representation of G is a vector configuration $\mathbf{v}$ indexed by the vertices of G in $\mathbb{R}^{n-d-1}$ with the following property: $\mathbf{v}_i$ is orthogonal to the vectors associated with each non-neighbor of vertex i. In contrast to a GOR, we do not require general linear position.*

They then ask: under what conditions is the set of ORs irreducible? Some progress on this question is reported in [19].

A Algebraic geometry background

Throughout this paper, we will be using some basic facts about real algebraic and semi algebraic sets. Here we summarize some preliminaries from real algebraic geometry, somewhat specialized to our particular case. For a general reference, see, for instance, the book by Bochnak, Coste, and Roy [6]. Much of this is adapted from [15].

Definition 8. *Let $\mathbf{k}$ be a subfield of $\mathbb{R}$. An affine, real* algebraic set *or* variety *V defined over $\mathbf{k}$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ that is defined by a set of algebraic equations with coefficients in $\mathbf{k}$.*

A real algebraic set has a real dimension $\dim(V)$*, which we will define as the largest t for which there is an open subset of V, in the Euclidean topology, that is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^t$.*

An algebraic set is irreducible *if it is not the union of two proper algebraic subsets defined over $\mathbb{R}$. Any reducible algebraic set V can be uniquely described as the union of a finite number of maximal irreducible algebraic subsets called the* components *of V.*

Any algebraic subset of an irreducible algebraic set must be of strictly lower dimension.

Any nested sequence of strict algebraic subsets must terminate in a finite number of steps. (This is called the Noetherian property). This means that if we continue to take strict algebraic subsets, we must eventually be left with the empty set.

A point x of an irreducible algebraic set V is called smooth *(in the algebraic sense) if the matrix of the partial derivatives of its defining equations achieves its maximal rank. Otherwise it is called singular. The singular locus of V is itself a variety, defined over $\mathbf{k}$.*

Every smooth point will also be smooth in the differential geometric sense. It has a neighborhood that is smoothly isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{\dim(V)}$.

If every point of V is smooth then we call V smooth.

Definition 9. *A* semi-algebraic set *S defined over* $\mathbf{k}$ *is a subset of* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *defined by algebraic equalities and inequalities with coefficients in* $\mathbf{k}$*, as well as Boolean operations. A semi-algebraic set has a well defined (maximal) dimension t.*

The real Zariski closure *of S is the smallest real algebraic set defined over $\mathbb{R}$ containing it. (We may need to enlarge the field to cut out the smallest algebraic set containing S but a finite extension will always suffice).*

We call S irreducible *if its real Zariski closure is irreducible.*

A semi-algebraic set S has the same real dimension as its real Zariski closure. Thus if two irreducible semi-algebraic sets of the same dimension have an intersection of that same dimension, then their union must be irreducible.

The image of a real algebraic or semi-algebraic set under a polynomial or rational map is semi-algebraic. The image of a real algebraic or semi-algebraic set under an injective polynomial or rational map has the same dimension as its domain. The image of as irreducible real algebraic or semi-algebraic set under a polynomial or rational map is irreducible.

A point on S is called smooth *if it is smooth (in the algebraic sense) in its Zariski closure and if it has a neighborhood in S smoothly isomorphic, in the differential geometric sense, to $\mathbb{R}^{\dim(S)}$.*

If every point of S is smooth, then we call S smooth.

Definition 10. *Let* $\mathbf{k}$ *be of countable subfield of $\mathbb{R}$. A point in a (semi-)algebraic set V defined over* $\mathbf{k}$ *is* generic *if its coordinates do not satisfy any algebraic equation with coefficients in* $\mathbf{k}$ *besides those that are satisfied by every point on V.*

Every generic point of a (semi-)algebraic set is smooth.

Almost every point in an irreducible (semi-)algebraic set V defined over $\mathbf{k}$ *is generic. If V is smooth, then the generic points are (Euclidean) dense in V.*

Lemma 10. *Let V and W be irreducible semi-algebraic sets and $f : V \to W$ be a surjective polynomial or rational map, all defined over* $\mathbf{k}$*. Then if $x \in V$ is generic, $f(x)$ is generic inside W.*

Proof. Consider any non-zero algebraic function ϕ on W defined over $\mathbf{k}$. Then $\phi(f(\cdot))$ is a function on V that is not identically zero. Thus if x is a generic point in V, $\phi(f(x)) \neq 0$. Since this is true for all ϕ, it follows that $f(x)$ is generic. □

Theorem 12. *Let S be an irreducible semi-algebraic. Let π be a polynomial or rational map from S into $\mathbb{R}^k$, for some k. Let s be a generic point in S, and $N(S)$ a sufficiently small Euclidean neighborhood of s in S. Then* $\dim(S) = \dim(\pi(S)) + \dim(\pi^{-1}(\pi(s)) \cap N(s))$.

Proof. From genericity, $N(s)$ is smooth, and the rank of the linearization, π^* is of constant rank. Thus by the constant rank theorem, we have $\dim(N(s)) = \dim(\pi(N(s))) + \dim(\pi^{-1}(\pi(s)) \cap N(s))$.

Since s is generic, we have $\dim(N(s)) = \dim(S)$.

Next we argue that $\dim(\pi(N(s))) = \dim(\pi(S))$, as follows. If $\dim(\pi(N(s)))$ were smaller, then the semi-algebraic set, $\pi(N(s))$ could be cut out from $\pi(S)$ by an algebraic equation, which means that $N(s)$ could be cut out of S by an algebraic equation. But a full dimensional subset cannot be removed from an irreducible semi-algebraic set by an algebraic equation. □

Remark 9. *Indeed it also can be shown (say using algebraic Sard's theorem on a smooth stratification of S) that at generic s,* $\dim(S) = \dim(\pi(S)) + \dim(\pi^{-1}(\pi(s)))$*, which also means that* $\dim(\pi^{-1}(\pi(s))) = \dim(\pi^{-1}(\pi(s)) \cap N(s))$*. But we will not need this.*

B Rational maps to kernels of matrices

A number of times in this paper, we will have some algebraic set S of n_1-by-n_2 matrices, and we will want to construct a map takes an $\mathbf{M} \in S$ to some vector in the kernel of $\mathbf{M}$. Let r be the maximal rank over the matrices in S. Here we will outline the general procedure and then work out the specific maps that are used in this paper.

We start by choosing some matrix $\mathbf{M}^0 \in S$ with rank r. We then select r rows of $\mathbf{M}^0$ that are linearly independent. We then find an $(n_2 - r)$-by-n_2 matrix $\mathbf{H}$ (with entries in $\mathbb{Q}$) such that the selected r rows of $\mathbf{M}^0$ together with the added rows from $\mathbf{H}$, form a non-singular matrix.

For any $\mathbf{M} \in S$, let $\mathbf{M}'$ be the square matrix obtained by using the same chosen r rows from $\mathbf{M}$, vertically appended with the matrix $\mathbf{H}$ chosen above. The matrix $\mathbf{M}'$ can only be singular over some strict subvariety of S. (When S is irreducible, singularity can only happen for non-generic $\mathbf{M}$.)

Given any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 - r}$, we define the vector $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ as a vector with r leading zeros appended to $\mathbf{x}$. We now define a rational map from $S \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2 - r} \to \mathbb{R}^m$ which maps $(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto (\mathbf{M}')^{-1}\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})$. Clearly, this map can be expressed using rational functions of the coordinates of $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{x}$. The map is not defined wherever $\mathbf{M}'$ is singular. Wherever the map is defined, its maps to some vector in the kernel of $\mathbf{M}$. For a fixed $\mathbf{M}$, the map is linear and injective over $\mathbf{x}$.

In the next sections, we will use variations on this construction. We alter the construction when we need specific properties of the kernel vectors.

B.1 Stresses of Frameworks in IR or IF_i

In Lemma 4, we wish to understand the structure of the equilibrium stress bundle over IR, a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{nd} \times \mathbb{R}^m$ consisting of pairs $(\mathbf{p}, \omega)$ where $(G, \mathbf{p}) \in \text{IR}$ and ω is an equilibrium stress vector of $(G, \mathbf{p})$. This is a vector bundle over IR. We will do this by looking at a rational map that maps from a framework to each of its equilibrium stresses. Since we want to understand the complete bundle, we may need to use a finite number of such maps, so that at least one map is defined at every framework in IR.

From Theorem 4 the dimension of IR is nd.

The rank of the rigidity matrix of any framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in IR is $nd - \binom{d+1}{2}$, and so the dimension of equilibrium stresses for this single framework is $m - nd + \binom{d+1}{2}$.

Lemma 11. *The equilibrium stress bundle of* IR *is irreducible and has dimension* $m + \binom{d+1}{2}$.

Proof. Let us denote by B, the equilibrium stress bundle over IR.

An equilibrium stress vector of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is just an element in the co-kernel of its rigidity matrix. So, using the general construction above (starting with a chosen configuration $\mathbf{p}^0$), we can build an injective rational map from $(\text{IR} \times \mathbb{R}^{m - nd + \binom{d+1}{2}})$ to B, of the form $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto (\mathbf{p}, \omega)$. The image of each such rational map is irreducible, and as an injective rational map has dimension $nd + [m - nd + \binom{d+1}{2}] = m + \binom{d+1}{2}$.

Such a rational map may be undefined over some subvariety V of IR, where the constructed linear system becomes singular, and thus its image may miss some subvariety of B. But we can always pick a different rational map (by starting with a different $\mathbf{p}^0$) so that it is undefined over a different subvariety W. Since IR is irreducible, V, W, and their union, must be of lower dimension than IR, and thus the region of IR where both maps are defined is full dimensional. For any framework where the map is defined, the image, as we vary $\mathbf{x}$, is the entire fiber above that framework in B. Thus if two maps are defined over a full dimensional region of IR, then their

images in B must have a full dimensional intersection. Thus the union of these images must itself be irreducible.

The subset of IR that is not defined under either map, $V \cap W$, is a strict algebraic subset of V. Due to the Noetherian property, a finite number of such rational maps is then guaranteed to have regions of definition that cover IR, and thus images that cover B, which thus must be irreducible. □ □

Similarly, in Lemma 5, we wish to understand the structure of the equilibrium stress bundle over IF_i.

By assumption the dimension of IF_i is $nd - C_i$ and the dimension of equilibrium stresses for any single framework in IF_i is $m - nd + \binom{d+1}{2} + F_i$. Using the exact same argument as Lemma 11 we conclude

Lemma 12. *The equilibrium stress bundle of* IF_i *is irreducible and has dimension* $[nd - C_i] + [m - nd + \binom{d+1}{2} + F_i]$

Lemma 13. *Let* $(G, \mathbf{p}^0)$*, a framework in* IF_i *(resp. IR), have an equilibrium stress* ω^0*. Then any nearby framework in* IF_i *(resp. IR) must have an equilibrium stress close to* ω^0*.*

Proof. Using the general construction above, starting with $\mathbf{p}^0$, we can build a rational map from $(\text{IF}_i \times \mathbb{R}^{m-nd+\binom{d+1}{2}+F_i})$ to $\mathbb{R}^m$, of the form $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \omega$, where ω is an equilibrium stress of $\mathbf{p}$, and such that the map is well defined in a neighborhood of $\mathbf{p}^0$. For an appropriate $\mathbf{x}^0$, we have $(\mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{x}^0) \mapsto \omega^0$. Since this map is continuous, for a nearby $\mathbf{q}$ we must have $(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{x}^0) \mapsto \omega$, where ω is close to ω^0. □

B.2 Infinitesimal Flexes of Frameworks in IF_i

In Lemma 9, we will want a rational map that maps from a framework in IF_i to a non-trivial infinitesimal flex of that framework. At a fixed framework, by varying the $\mathbf{x}$ parameters, we wish the image to be an F_i-dimensional space of such flexes.

Lemma 14. *, We can define a rational map (f stands for flex),* $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}) : \text{IF}_i \times \mathbb{R}^{F_i} \to \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ *that (over its domain/where there is no division by zero) maps to a non-trivial infinitesimal flex* $\mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ *of* $\mathbf{p}$*, and for a fixed* $\mathbf{p}$*, the map is a linear injective map over* $\mathbf{x}$*.*

Proof. Again, we will use our general construction above to define such a map. But we need to make special care to make sure that the image of the map does not contain any trivial flexes. This requires a bit of care in defining the extra rows to complete our square matrix, as well as how we construct the $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})$ vector.

We proceed as follows: Pick $\mathbf{p}^0$, a generic configuration of IF_i. Pick a subset of $nd - \binom{d+1}{2} - F_i$ edges that are independent in $(G, \mathbf{p}^0)$. Instead of completing this matrix with a constant $\mathbf{H}$ matrix, we do the following: Add a set of F_i "fake edges" to this subset to create a graph G' so that $(G', \mathbf{p}^0)$ is infinitesimally rigid. (This can be done, one by one, as $\mathbf{p}^0$ has a full d-dimensional affine span). Finally create $\mathbf{J}$, an $\binom{d+1}{2}$-by-nd matrix of constants so that the rows of $\mathbf{J}$ form a linear complement to the rows of the rigidity matrix of $(G', \mathbf{p}^0)$.

For any $\mathbf{p}$ we define its nd-by-nd modified, non-singular, rigidity matrix $\mathbf{M}'(\mathbf{p})$, as the rigidity matrix of $(G', \mathbf{p})$ with the added rows of the $\mathbf{J}$ matrix above appended to it. We invert this to obtain $(\mathbf{M}'(\mathbf{p}))^{-1}$.

Let $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})$ be the nd-vector with $nd - \binom{d+1}{2} - F_i$ leading zeros, followed by the F_i coordinates of $\mathbf{x}$, followed by $\binom{d+1}{2}$ more zeros. Then $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}) := (\mathbf{M}'(\mathbf{p}))^{-1}\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})$ gives us our desired map. Any non-zero coordinates in $\mathbf{x}$ will ensure that some fake edge changes its length at first order, thus making our obtained flex, non-trivial. □

B.3 A framework in the Kernel of a Stress Matrix

In section 6 we want a rational map that maps from a stress matrix Ω to a framework in it kernel with a d-dimensional affine span. We can represent such a framework as a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{nd}$. We can represent the kernel condition using the nd-by-nd matrix $\mathbf{I}_d \bigotimes \Omega$.

Again, we can then apply our general construction above. In order to obtain a framework with a full d-dimensional affine span, we set the extra $\mathbf{H}$ rows to represent the pinning of $d+1$ specific vertices. We fix the non-zero elements of the right hand side, $\mathbf{v}$, to place these pinned vertex in general affine position. In this setting, we only want one framework per stress, so there are no free variables $\mathbf{x}$.

The map will be undefined over some subvariety V of Str, (which includes, for example all of the Ω of rank strictly less than $n-d-1$, and all of the equilibrium stress matrices of frameworks where the chosen $d+1$ vertices lie in a single hyperplane).

References

[1] Abdo Y. Alfakih and Yinyu Ye. On affine motions and bar frameworks in general position. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 438(1):31–36, 2013.

[2] Abdo Y. Alfikih. Graph connectivity and universal rigidity of bar frameworks. *arXiv:1407.2199*, 2014.

[3] Leonard Asimow and Ben Roth. The rigidity of graphs. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 245:279–289, 1978.

[4] Leonard Asimow and Ben Roth. The rigidity of graphs, II. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 68(1):171–190, 1979.

[5] Alex R. Berg and Tibor Jordán. A proof of Connelly's conjecture on 3-connected circuits of the rigidity matroid. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 88(1):77–97, 2003.

[6] Jacek Bochnak, Michel Coste, and Marie-Françoise Roy. *Real algebraic geometry*, volume 36 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[7] Robert Connelly. Rigidity and energy. *Invent. Math.*, 66(1):11–33, 1982.

[8] Robert Connelly. On generic global rigidity. In *Applied geometry and discrete mathematics*, volume 4 of *DIMACS Ser. Discrete Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, pages 147–155. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1991.

[9] Robert Connelly. Generic global rigidity. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 33(4):549–563, 2005.

[10] Robert Connelly and Allen Back. Mathematics and tensegrity. *American Scientist*, 85(2):142–150, 1998.

[11] Robert Connelly and Walter Whiteley. Global rigidity: the effect of coning. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 43(4):717–735, 2010.

[12] Erik Demaine, John Ochsendorf, Martin Demaine, Simon Greenwold, Axel Kilian, and Barbara Cutler. Online course 4.491: Form-finding and structural optimization: Gaudi workshop. `http://ocs.mit.edu`.

[13] David Eisenbud. Linear sections of determinantal varieties. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 110(3):541–575, 1988.

[14] Marc Giusti and Michel Merle. Sections des variétés déterminantielles par les plans de coordonnées. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Alg. Geometry*, pages 103–118, 1981.

[15] Steven J. Gortler, Alexander D. Healy, and Dylan P. Thurston. Characterizing generic global rigidity. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 132(132):897–939, 2010.

[16] Steven J. Gortler and Dylan P. Thurston. Characterizing the universal rigidity of generic frameworks. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 51(4):1017–1036, 2014.

[17] Bruce Hendrickson. Conditions for unique graph realizations. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 21(1):65–84, 1992.

[18] Bruce Hendrickson. The molecule problem: exploiting structure in global optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 5(4):835–857, 1995.

[19] Jürgen Herzog, Antonio Macchia, Sara Saeedi Madani, and Volkmar Welker. On the ideal of orthogonal representations of a graph in $\mathbb{R}^2$. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 71:146–173, 2015.

[20] Bill Jackson and Tibor Jordán. Connected rigidity matroids and unique realizations of graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 94(1):1–29, 2005.

[21] Matthew Jacobs. Connecting global and universal rigidity. *arXiv:1011.4122*, pages 1–13, 2010.

[22] Charles R Johnson and Pablo Tarazaga. Connections between the real positive semidefinite and distance matrix completion problems. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 223:375–391, 1995.

[23] Tibor Jordán and Zoltán Szabadka. Operations preserving the global rigidity of graphs and frameworks in the plane. *Comput. Geom.*, 42(6-7):511–521, 2009.

[24] L. Lovász, M. Saks, and A. Schrijver. Orthogonal representations and connectivity of graphs. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 114/115:439–454, 1989.

[25] J. B. Saxe. Embeddability of weighted graphs in k-space is strongly NP-hard. In *Proc. 17th Allerton Conf. in Communications, Control, and Computing*, pages 480–489, 1979.

[26] Anthony Man-Cho So and Yinyu Ye. Theory of semidefinite programming for sensor network localization. *Math. Program.*, 109(2-3, Ser. B):367–384, 2007.